



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/626,913	07/25/2003	Thomas A. Saldarelli	35451	2415

116 7590 01/20/2006

PEARNE & GORDON LLP
1801 EAST 9TH STREET
SUITE 1200
CLEVELAND, OH 44114-3108

EXAMINER

KATCHEVES, BASIL S

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3635

DATE MAILED: 01/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/626,913		SALDARELLI ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Basil Katcheves		3635	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 August 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

The claims 1, 7 and 15 are objected as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims are drawn to either a tubular body and base plate or the base plate alone. However, limitations are given for a post, which is not claimed, appearing to be a combination. The claims are examined as being a subcombination not including the post. Clarification is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,391,660 to Stewart as in the previous office action.

Regarding claims 1 and 7, Stewart discloses an anchor assembly with a hollow tubular body (fig. 3: 22) fitted on top of a truncated, tapered conical baseplate (fig. 2: 21).

Regarding claims 2 and 8, Stewart discloses the cross sections of the body and baseplate as circular.

Regarding claims 3, 9 and 17, Stewart discloses the baseplate as a truncated conic spaced radially inward from the body.

Regarding claims 4, 10 and 18, Stewart discloses the baseplate as having an opening (fig. 3: where 27 fits).

Regarding claims 5, 11 and 19, Stewart discloses the baseplate as having an arcuate flange (fig. 3: 18) extending radially outward.

Regarding claims 6, 12 and 20, Stewart discloses the baseplate as large enough to inherently cause friction between another object.

Regarding claim 13, Stewart discloses the circumference of the conical portion as continuous.

Regarding claim 14, Stewart discloses the radial dimension of the arcuate section (fig. 3: 18) as being greater than the radial dimension of the conical portion.

Claim 15 is rejected for reasons cited in the rejection of claims 1 and 14.

Regarding claim 16, Stewart discloses the surface as being circular in cross section (fig. 3).

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,401,908 to Rapata as in the previous office action.

Regarding claims 1, 7, Rapata discloses an anchor assembly having a hollow tubular anchor body (fig. 5: 10) with an arcuate interior cross section, and a hollow lower end (fig. 5: where 16 points). Rapata also discloses a base plate (fig. 1: 18) having an arcuate portion (fig. 2: bottom foot of side walls 18) shaped to mate with the arcuate section of the anchor body (fig. 2), the base plate includes an upstanding arcuate conical, tapered section (fig. 4: 18).

Regarding claim 2, 8 and 16, Rapata discloses the anchor body as having a circular interior cross section (fig. 1).

Regarding claim 3, 9 and 17, Rapata discloses the conical section of the baseplate as being truncated.

Regarding claim 4, 10 and 18, Rapata discloses the baseplate as having an axially extending opening (fig. 7: 30a).

Regarding claim 5, 11 and 19, Rapata discloses the baseplate as having an arcuate flange (fig. 1: ring around 18) extending outwardly from the base plate.

Regarding claim 6, 12 and 20, Rapata discloses the conical section of the baseplate as inherently large enough to cause friction against an object pressed against it.

Regarding claim 13, Rapata discloses the conical portion as having a continuous circumference.

Regarding claim 14, Rapata discloses the arcuate portion of the baseplate (fig. 2: bottom foot of sidewalls 18) as having a larger radial dimension than the conical portion (fig. 2: 18).

Regarding claim 15, claim 15 is rejected for reasons cited in the rejections of claims 1 and 14.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 8/8/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Stewart and Rapata references do not have two open ends and that it is not configured to accept a post. Applicant should note that these references have two open ends (see action above, and also Stewart fig. 2: top

section with bolt, and Rapata fig. 2). Applicant should also note that, as mentioned in the previous office action, the post is not being claimed. The references both disclose the basic claim structure of the instant application. The applicant argues the use of structures which are not being claimed. Applicant should note that the references meet the basic claim limitations of the anchor assembly, which is being claimed.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Basil Katcheves whose telephone number is (571) 272-6846. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:30 am to 4:00 pm.

Art Unit: 3635

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carl Friedman, can be reached at (571) 272-6842.

BK 

1/17/06


Carl D. Friedman
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3600